



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/623,208	08/29/00	BAYLOT	M 33900-73PUS

QM02/1009

MARTIN B PAVANE  
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE  
551 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 1210  
NEW YORK NY 10176

EXAMINER

MCKINNON, T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3743

DATE MAILED: 10/09/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/623,208

Applicant(s)

BAYLOT ET AL.

Examiner

Terrell L Mckinnon

Art Unit

3743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 26-28 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 10 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 9 and 12-25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 August 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3743

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout and content for patent applications. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

### **Arrangement of the Specification**

The following order or arrangement is preferred in framing the specification and, except for the reference to "Microfiche Appendix" and the drawings, each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as section headings. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) Title of the Invention.
- (b) Cross-References to Related Applications.
- (c) Statement Regarding Federally Sponsored Research or Development.
- (d) Reference to a "Microfiche Appendix" (see 37 CFR 1.96).
- (e) Background of the Invention.
  - 1. Field of the Invention.
  - 2. Description of the Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (f) Brief Summary of the Invention.
- (g) Brief Description of the Several Views of the Drawing(s).
- (h) Detailed Description of the Invention.
- (i) Claim or Claims (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (j) Abstract of the Disclosure (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) Drawings.
- (l) Sequence Listing (see 37 CFR 1.821-1.825).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since

Art Unit: 3743

the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired.

Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language.

The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949).

In the present instance, claim 11 recites the broad recitation "virtually incompressible material is constituted, to at least 90%, of chemical compounds of the family of alkanes", and the claim also recites "preferably a paraffin comprising a hydrocarbon chain with at least 10 carbon atoms" which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3743

2. Claims 1-6, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Best (U.S. 3,948,313) in view of Watkins (U.S. 6,058,979).

Best discloses an arrangement to control heat flow between a member and its environment comprising:

- a device for insulating at least one underwater pipe (column 1, lines 1-23);
- an insulating coating (17 and 18) surrounding the pipe (12) and a protective envelope (skins 20);
- the insulating coating (18) comprises a virtually incompressible liquid/solid phase change material (24) with a melting temperature higher (between 20 and 80 degrees Celsius) than that of the medium surrounding the pipe, and less than that of the effluents circulating in the pipe (column 4, lines 47-53, lines 59-60, and column 3, lines 54-55);
- the use of designing the thermal cell to allow for expansion and contraction of the liquid (24) as the temperature changes (column 4, lines 67-column 5, line 2);
- the protective envelope (cylindrical skins 20) is resistant, deformable and ensures containment about the insulating coating and support for the pipe (column 4, lines 35-38);
- the insulating coating comprises an light, cellular or fibrous absorbent matrix (matrix 22) surrounding the outside of the pipe preferably

Art Unit: 3743

nearest its outer surface (column 11, lines 7-30) and impregnated with the liquid/solid phase change material (column 4, lines 29-49, and see fig. 11); and

- the use of the protective envelope comprising at least one vent permeable to the gas that may diffuse through the underwater pipe (column 2, lines 9-20).

Best fails to disclose the protective envelope being made of thermoplastic material.

3. However, Watkins teaches the use of a deep-sea insulated pipeline including a protective cover made of a thermoplastic material (column 4, lines 8-11).

Given the teachings of Watkins, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the outer protective pipe of Best with a protective envelope being made of thermoplastic material.

Doing so would provide a protective cover that's flexible hard and tough.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 26-28 are allowed.

Claims 7, 9, 13, and 16-25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 12, 14, and 15 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to

Art Unit: 3743

include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following references are cited for related limitations of the applicants claimed and disclosed invention. Costes, Matthieu et al, Schmiade, Leon et al, Krieg et al, C.H. Parsons et al, Deutsch, Pugh, and Best ('502).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Terrell L Mckinnon whose telephone number is 703-305-0059. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ira Lazarus can be reached on 308-1935. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7764 for regular communications and 703-308-7764 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.



TM

September 28, 2001



Ira S. Lazarus  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3700